REMARKS

Claims 1-18, 20-21, 23-37 and 39-62 are pending prior to amending the application.

The Examiner rejects claims 1-3, 9-15, 18, 20, 21, 28-35, 37, 39, 40, 46-53, 56, and 57 under 35 USC §102(e) as anticipated by Michel et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,215,562).

The Examiner rejects claims 4-6, 23-25, 41-43 and 58-60 under 35 USC §103(a) as unpatentable over Michel in view of Sawano (U.S. Patent no. 6,384,895).

The Examiner rejects claims 7, 16, 17, 26, 36, 44, 54, 55 and 61 under 35 USC §103(a) as unpatentable over Michel in view of Yamaguchi (U.S. Patent No. 6,788,431).

The Examiner rejects claims 8, 27, 45 and 62 under 35 USC §103(a) as unpatentable over Michel in view of Housel (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0164960).

Applicant amends claims 1, 15, 16, 18, 37, and 56, adds 63 and 64 claims, and cancels claim 14. Claims 1-13, 15-18, 20-21, 23-37 and 39-64 remain after amending this application. Applicant adds no new matter and requests reconsideration.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102 and § 103

The Examiner deems claims 1-13, 15-18, 20-21, 23-37 and 39-62 as old or obvious over Michel variously in view of Shawano, Yamaguchi, and Housel. The Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejections.

The Applicant discloses a printing system that characterizes multiple printing media to be printed on by a printing device. The printing media are characterized through the calibration of one or more adjustable settings of a printing device. The printing system retains these multiple characterizations in a memory for subsequent use by the printing device.

Amended claim 1 recites *a memory to store multiple configurations of the adjustable settings, each configuration of the adjustable settings corresponding to a different printing medium* and *a controller having an off line mode for characterizing one or more of the printing media by determining one or more of the corresponding configurations of the adjustable settings*. Amended claim 18 recites *storing multiple sets of printer settings in a memory, each set characterizing a different printing medium*.

According to the Examiner, Michel's cyan, magenta, and yellow color ink responses disclose the recited adjustable settings. The Examiner appears to allege Michel's target memory 50 and printer engine 10 disclose the recited memory and controller, respectively. The target memory 50, however, stores the current calibration of the printer engine 10, not

multiple configurations of the cyan, magenta, and yellow color ink responses as the claims require. There is further no disclosure in Michel of storing separate configurations of the cyan, magenta, and yellow color ink responses for each printing medium printed on by the printer engine 10. Put differently, Michel does not teach or suggest storing multiple sets of printer settings, much less sets that characterize specific printing media. Michel therefore does not anticipate claims 1 and 18, or their corresponding dependent claims.

Amended claim 37 recites *receiving a media identifier that uniquely identifies the first printing medium*, and *compiling a data file in a memory that includes the first and second feedback inputs and the media identifier, where the media identifier indicates that the first and second feedback inputs correspond to the first printing medium*. Amended claim 56 recites *storing a media identifier that uniquely identifies the printer medium in the memory, where the media identifier indicates that the first and second feedback inputs correspond to the printing medium*.

Applicant agrees with the Examiner, that Michel fails to expressly disclose the recited media identifier. See, Final Office Action, page 12. The Examiner appears to allege Yamaguchi's identification marking discloses the recited media identifier. Yamaguchi, however, does not teach storing the identification marking within a memory as the claims require, much less storing the media identifier in a data file with the recited first and second feedback inputs. Michel therefore does not anticipate claims 37 and 56, or their corresponding dependent claims.

Neither Michel nor Yamaguchi further provide any motivation to combine the inventions described therein. The Examiner alleges since both Michel and Yamaguchi teach "systems that calibrate a printing device using a printed calibration pattern," that "[i]t would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Yamaguchi's method of identifying calibration patterns with Michel's system." Final Office Action, page 13. Even if Yamaguchi taught the recited *media identifier*, this combination would not have provided motivation for Michel to include the media identifier within its system, as Michel does not calibrate its printer engine 10 to characterize any specific media. Put differently, since Michel does not contain any media specific calibrations of its printer engine 10, the addition of Yamaguchi's identification marking to identify those non-existent calibrations would serve no beneficial purpose. Thus combining the references, as the Examiner suggests, is to no avail. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn and the pending claims be allowed to issue.

Claim 18 recites:

identifying a plurality of first calibration values for the first setting of the printing device,

receiving a first feedback input that identifies one of the first calibration values as preferred for the first setting,

identifying a plurality of second calibration values for a second setting of the printing device, and

receiving a second feedback input that identifies one of the second calibration values as preferred for the second setting. Claims 2 and 37 recite similar limitations.

According to the Examiner, Michel's "Gray Balance" printer calibration method shown in Figure 3 discloses these limitations. The Examiner appears to allege two of Michel's cyan, magenta, and yellow color ink responses disclose the recited first and second settings. Michel however teaches a single "Apply Changes" input for calibration of the cyan, magenta, and yellow color ink responses, not separate and distinct feedback inputs as the claims require.

Michel's "Gray Balance" printer calibration method further calibrates the cyan, magenta, and yellow color ink responses simultaneously. To further crystallize this distinction, the Applicant amends claims 18 and 37 to clarify that identifying a plurality of second calibration values for a second setting of the printing device occurs after receiving the first feedback input for the first setting. Since Michel calibrates all of the color ink responses simultaneously, not sequentially as the claims require, Michel does not teach or suggest the recited second setting. Michel therefore does not anticipate claims 2, 18 and 37 and their corresponding dependent claims.

Amended claim 56 recites *selecting a first setting of a printing device for calibration with a printing medium* and *selecting a second setting of the printing device for calibration with the printing medium after the entering of the first feedback input in the memory*. As we allege above, Michel does not teach or suggest the recited second setting of the printing device that is calibrated separate and distinctly from the first setting, much less selecting any setting for calibration after the entering the first feedback input in memory. Michel therefore does not anticipate claims 56 or its corresponding dependent claims.

Claim 1 recites *a controller... adapted to identify a plurality of first calibration values for a first setting of the adjustable settings through derivation of at least one trigger value*. Claims 29 and 47 recite similar limitations. The Examiner alleges Michel's printer engine 10 discloses the recited controller. The Examiner appears to argue Michel's patches of a printed

Limits page disclose the recited first calibration values. There is no disclosure in Michel of deriving the patches of the Limits page, much less from the recited trigger value. Michel, col. 7, lines 59-60, where Michel prints copies of the Limits page which are stored in the target memory 50. Michel therefore does not anticipate claims 1, 29, and 47, and their corresponding dependent claims.

New Claims

The Applicant adds claims 63 and 64, which depend from independent claim 1.

Claim 63 recites *the controller characterizes a printing medium that is a non-white paper or a transparency*. As argued above, Michel does not teach characterizing any printing media. Michel's "Gray Balance" printer calibration method further requires its Limits page to be printed on white paper, not non-white paper or a transparency as the claim requires. See, Michel, col. 5, lines 38-60. Michel therefore does not anticipate claim 63.

Claim 64 recites *the controller receives the trigger value from the interface*, and *the trigger value is one of the first calibration values*. The Examiner alleges Michel's printer engine 10 and keypad 20 disclose the recited controller and interface, respectively. The Examiner further alleges Michel's Limits page discloses the recited calibration values. There is no disclosure in Michel, however, of the printer engine 10 receiving any of the calibration values from the keypad 20. Michel therefore does not anticipate claim 64.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and allowance of all claims remaining after amending the application is solicited. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.

Jeffrey J. Richmond
Reg. No. 57,564

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.
210 SW Morrison Street, Suite 400
Portland, OR 97204
503-222-3613
Customer No. 46404